DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 837 SP 030 157

AUTHOR Wood, Fred H.; And Others
TITLE The Perceptions of Professors and Practitioners Concerning the Practices Which Define the RPTIM Model for Staff Development. Occasional Paper No. 15.
INSTITUTION National Staff Development Council, Oxford, OH.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Delivery Systems; *Inservice Education; *Models; Needs Assessment; *Program Design; *Program Effectiveness; *Staff Development

ABSTRACT

A model for staff development called "Staff Development/Organizational Development" (Wood/Thompson/Russell, 1981) describes a process for designing inservice that is systematic and comprehensive. The model was developed through an analysis and synthesis of the literature and research related to staff development. This paper briefly describes the assumptions underlying the five stages of the model (Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance) and the practices which define the process of designing staff development. A report is given of the results of a national study that was conducted in early 1981 to determine the extent to which practitioners and professors of education with expertise in staff development believed these practices should be used and were being used to design inservice programs across the United States. Eleven references are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294837

THE PERCEPTIONS OF PROFESSORS AND PRACTITIONERS CONCERNING THE PRACTICES WHICH DEFINE THE RPTIM MODEL FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

by

Fred H. Wood
Frank O. McQuarrie, Jr.
Steven R. Thompson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Harless

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP030157

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Occasional Paper No. 15

May, 1985

* Occasional Paper Series

National Staff Development Council

Staff development in schools is like a maze. It is a network of confusing and complex passages. It's really difficult for those of us in this maze to find the "true path" for designing staff development programs for a school's personnel. We seem to constantly wander up blind alleys and to run into insurrmountable barriers (McQuarrie, Wood & Thompson, 1984). While research shows us that teachers, administrators, college personnel, leaders of teacher organizations, and other educators believe that inservice is a most important professional activity, the research also indicates they are not satisfied with current inservice programs. Educators generally report that inservice is poorly planned and organized, ineffective and lacks relevance (Joyce & Peck, 1977). As one educator put it, it's the slum area of American education--at least it's one of the slum areas (Wagstaff & McCullough, 1973).

In response to these problems, professors of education and others with interest and expertise in the area of staff development have developed lists of principles, characteristics, and guidelines which they believe should shape professional development programs. Educational journals have reported a wide range of inservice programs and strategies that have been used in schools. But these programs, guidelines, and principles seem to add to our confusion in the maze rather than to help us find our way out.

We seem to know most of the problems, have identified the general characteristics of desirable staff development, and have a number of concrete examples of programs and strategies that work in schools. What is needed at this time in our history is a way of putting these pieces into a meaningful whole, a framework or model which describes the process of designing staff development programs and provides us with a path out of the maze that we're in.

Until recently there have been few if any comprehensive models that provide a systematic approach to designing staff development. However, the model described in Chapter 4 of the 1981 ASCD Yearbook, Staff Development/Organizational Development, is one approach that seems to hold promise for planning and implementing effective inservice for professional educators (Wood, Thompson & Russell, 1981). It describes a process for designing inservice that is systematic and comprehensive. This model identifies what happens before and after, as well as during, the planning and training phases of inservice. It also specifies the practices that should be used by individuals who design staff development programs. Although this approach may not be the only "true path," it offers at least one way out of the inservice maze.

This model was developed through a careful analysis and synthesis of

the literature and research related to staff development. It was extrapolated from what we know about staff development, organizational development, educational change, adult learning, professional growth, and school climate. At the time this model was developed, however, there was no way of assessing whether the procedures described were, in fact, those that should be used in schools or if, in fact, they were even valued by those responsible for staff development.

In the remainder of this paper we will briefly describe the assumptions underlying the five stages of the Wood/Thompson/Russell model reported in the 1981 ASCD Yearbook and the practices which define that process of designing staff development. Once we've described the model, we will report the results of a national study that was conducted in early 1981 to determine the extent to which practitioners and professors of education with expertise in staff development believed these practices a) should be used and b) were being used to design inservice programs across the United States.

The Model

The Model presented in the 1981 ASCD Yearbook is based upon 10 basic beliefs or assumptions. It is important to recognize the difference between the assumptions which currently guide inservice programs and those proposed in the model. Different assumptions lead to substantially different ways of delivering staff development.

Before presenting the assumptions underlying the 1981 model, we need to first examine the assumptions that appear to have guided past attempts at staff development in the public schools. These assumptions are implicit in the way we have operated although we may never admit to them. They include:

1. **THE "TEACHER NEEDS IT" ASSUMPTION.** Inservice is primarily for teachers! Who else would need renewal!

2. **THE "HERE AND NOW" ASSUMPTION.** Inservice should respond to immediate or short-range needs and interests of teachers and/or immediate problems in the district--not long-range or program changes.

3. **THE "LET SOMEONE ELSE PAY THE BILL" ASSUMPTION.** It's clear from the way we operate we view inservice as something that someone else should pay for, not the district; and that inservice does not need a substantial budget line.

4. **THE "DISTRICT-WIDE" ASSUMPTION.** The primary focus of inservice should be on district-wide needs because the needs of individual schools are all the same.

5. **THE "COSMETIC EFFECT" ASSUMPTION.** Inservice is something we should have regardless of the impact it has--staff development is more cosmetic than substantive and has lower value in education that in any other profession.

6. **THE "INSTANT IMPROVEMENT" ASSUMPTION.** Two or three days of inservice each year are adequate to improve instructional programs and practice.

7. **THE "PSYCH JOB" ASSUMPTION.** Inservice is to psych teachers up, to make them aware of ideas, programs and procedures through inspirational messages. Why else would we spent $1,500 to hire Drs. X, Y, or Z to speak about learning styles, inquiry teaching, or affective education and then let them leave? Nothing happens as a result of these presentations other than people getting excited and feeling good about the ideas.

8. **THE "AUTOMATIC TRANSFER" ASSUMPTION.** Teachers are able to automatically transfer what is presented in inservice sessions to the work setting; follow-up is not needed after training.

9. **THE "PASSIVE RECIPIENT" ASSUMPTION.** Participants in inservice are to be recipients of, not actually involved in, inservice. They don't need to get direct practice in what they're supposed to be learning.

10. **THE "LET'S DO IT TO THEM" ASSUMPTION.** Inservice is done to or for someone. Teachers and other educators don't need to take responsibility for their own professional growth; that's the responsibility of the central office administrator or at least the administrator of a building.

11. **THE "LET'S GET EVERYONE TOGETHER" ASSUMPTION.** Everyone should experience the same inservice because that will result in common practice and standardization of programs across the district.

12. **THE "OUTSIDE EXPERT" ASSUMPTION.** Leadership for inservice workshops should come from experts outside the district or administrators who are really the experts.

13. **THE "ROLE CALL" OR "BUTT TIME" ASSUMPTION.** One of the most important things about inservice is to make sure people attend. We worry more about those people who don't want to be involved than the people who really want to be there.

We all recognize these assumptions from some of our own experiences with inservice. It is not easy to admit that these assumptions underlie many of our staff development programs, but in fact, they do.

Unfortunately, they fly in the face of what we know from research and best practice.

Now back to the model presented in the 1981 Yearbook. There are 10 assumptions that ungird that model and they are quite different from those that we have just stated. They include:

1. **THE "CAREER LONG" ASSUMPTION.** All school personnel need inservice throughout their careers.

2. **THE "LONG-TERM CHANGE" ASSUMPTION.** Significant improvement in educational practices takes considerable time and long-term inservice programs.

3. **THE "PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT" ASSUMPTION.** Inservice education should focus on the quality of the school program.

4. **THE "LEARNER CONTROL" ASSUMPTION.** Educators are motivated to learn new things when they have some control over their learning and are free from threat.

5. **THE "INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES" ASSUMPTION.** Educators vary widely in their competence and readiness to learn.

6. **THE "GROUP COMMITMENT" ASSUMPTION.** Professional growth requires commitment on the part of groups of educators in a school to new performance norms.

7. **THE "POSITIVE CLIMATE" ASSUMPTION.** School climate influences the success of professional development.

8. **THE "SCHOOL AS A UNIT OF CHANGE" ASSUMPTION.** The school is the most appropriate unit of change in education.

9. **THE "DISTRICTS RESOURCES" ASSUMPTION.** School districts have the primary responsibility for providing the resources for inservice training.

10. **THE "PRINCIPAL AS GATEKEEPER" ASSUMPTION.** The principal is the key element for adoption and continued use of new practices and programs in schools (Wood, Thompson & Russell, 1981).

The five stages of staff development that grew out of these assumptions and research include Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation and Maintenance. The Readiness Stage emphasizes selection, understanding of, and commitment to new professional behaviors by a school staff. It deals with issues of school climate, developing group norms, group expectations, and goals for improvement. The Planning Stage focuses on developing specific plans for conducting professional development activities required to achieve the goals set in the readiness stage. The Training Stage is where the staff development plans are implemented. These practices

correspond with what we know about adult learners and adult learning. The fourth stage, Implementation, is where new knowledge and skills learned in the inservice training are installed into the everyday work setting. It is the transition from the learning into practice. The Maintenance Stage is where the professional behaviors that are installed in the daily practice are monitored to assure that they continue to be used in the schools and are implemented at a high level of performance.

Each stage is defined by a set of four to eleven practices that ensure successful implementation. These practices identify specific tasks that are to be implemented in the stage and the persons who make key decisions. The 38 practices that are included in the Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation and Maintenance Model are reported in Tables 1-5 presented later in this paper. A detailed explanation of these practices with specific examples of how school personnel have implemented them is presented in the 1981 ASCD Yearbook (Wood, Thompson & Russell, 1981).

SUMMARY OF THE NATIONAL STUDY

Once the five-stage RPTIM Model was generated, the next step was to determine whether it described practices that should be employed when inservice programs are designed and implemented in schools. In an effort to determine the extent to which the practices should be implemented and the extent to which these practices were actually implemented as inservice was planned and delivered in schools, a national study was conducted in the spring of 1981.

To collect expert opinions concerning the appropriateness of the 38 practices and the underlying assumptions, a questionnaire was mailed to the regular membership of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision and the National Staff Development Council. These two professional organizations represented a national sample of professors and practitioners with expertise in the area of staff development. The 50 COPIS members had a major commitment to research, teaching and service in the area of supervision and professional development. The 378 regular members of the National Staff Development Council were all actively engaged in planning staff development programs for school personnel as part of their current job responsibilities.

"The Survey of Effective Staff Development Practices" (Thompson, 1982) was used to assess the perceptions of the extent to which these two groups of experts valued each of the 38 practices and assumptions. The response options for indicating the extent to which the practices should be used included "amost never," "sometimes," "often," and "amost always." The same

options were used when assessing the extent to which the practices were actually implemented in schools. The traditional "strongly disagree," "disagree," "agree," and "strongly agree" options were used when assessing the commitment of the two groups to the 10 assumptions that underpinned the five-stage model.

RESULTS

Before we report the results of this national study, we need to look at each of the stages and examine the practices in that stage so that you'll have a better idea of what each stage actually demands of a school staff and a school district. Then we'll look at the degree to which the two groups indicated that these practices should guide staff development in schools and the extent to which they perceived that these practices have been implemented. We'll also look at whether there was agreement or disagreement between practitioners and professors in their commitment to these outcomes.

Readiness Stage

There are eight practices which define Readiness (Table 1). The first identifies the need to develop a positive school climate before starting staff development programs. The second indicates that there is a need to involve teachers, parents and the school administrators in a collaborative effort of setting goals for improvement in the school. This practice indicates that all the people who might block or facilitate the process should be involved in identifying and becoming committed to the goals for improvement of a school. These goals become the goals of staff development.

The third practice suggests that the school improvement goals are long term--to be achieved over three to five years. We are not looking for instant change or short-range needs. We're looking at long-term, lasting changes that we want to make in the schools as a result of staff development. The fourth practice indicates that, through some means, the school staff needs to adopt and commit to the goals for improvement in their schools. The goals are not something that are mandated from central office; they are something that the school staff agrees to and becomes committed to by agreeing to the changes implied by the goals.

Outcomes five and six suggest that once the goals are set, programs and practices within the school and outside the school are examined to see which should be kept and which, not in operation at the school, should be adopted from other places to achieve their long-range improvement goals. The seventh outcome in this stage indicates that principal and teacher be

TABLE 1: READINESS STAGE PRACTICES

RPTIM PRACTICES	% of Often/Almost Always Ratings			
	Should Be		Exist	
	COPIS	NSDE	COPIS	NSDC
(1.) A positive school climate is developed before other staff development efforts are attempted. (A positive climate is characterized by open communication, trust, and supportive relationships.)	98	94	10	44*
[2.] Goals for school improvement are written collaboratively by teachers, parents, building administrators, and central office administration.	98	95	16	52*
[3.] The school has a written list of goals for the improvement of school programs during the next three to five years.	98	98	22	54*
(4.) The school staff adopt and support goals for the improvement of school programs.	100	99	27	62*
[5.] Current school practices are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the school's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned.	98	97	20	47*
6. Current educational practices not yet found in the school are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the school's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned.	93	95	13	43*
(7.) The school staff identified specific plans to achieve the school's goals for improvement.	95	98	22	56*
8. Leadership and support during the initial stage of staff development activitiy are the responsibility of the principal and central office staff.	88	84	88	70

○ = A practice seen as essential by both Professors (COPIS) and Practitioners (NSDC).
□ = A practice seen as essential by Practitioners (NSDC).
* = Significant Difference (.01 level) in the mean responses recorded by Professors and Practitioners.

involved as specific practices and plans are made for improvement and for reaching their improvement goals. Finally, the last outcome indicates that in the Readiness Stage leadership comes from the central office and principal. They are the only individuals who have the power to say, "In fact, we are going to change; we are going to improve this school."

As we look at these outcomes that define Readiness and the responses from the members of COPIS and NSDC concerning what should be and what exists, we find some very interesting results. First, let's look at commitment, "what should be." Ninety percent or more of the practitioners and professors believed that outcomes 1-7 should be implemented "often" or "almost always" when inservice is planned and delivered in school districts. Over 80 percent of them had this same response to have administration initiate the Readiness Stage.

If we define an essential practice as one that is identified by 70 percent of one or both groups as something that should happen almost always, then six of the eight Readiness outcomes are viewed as essential. Both practitioners and professors indicate that developing a positive school climate, developing staff support for the goals of the school improvement, and involving the staff in identifying specific plans to achieve the school improvement goals are all essential practices in the Readiness Stage. The practitioners also saw as essential to staff development Readiness the collaborative development of goals for school improvement, having five-year goals rather than one-year goals for improvement, and examining current school practices to determine whether they were congruent with the improvement goals that they'd set.

One of the things that we were concerned about was whether there were any significant differences between practitioners and professors in their commitment to these Readiness outcomes. To test this, we ran simple *t* tests between the means of the two groups on each of the 38 practices. We found that there were no significant differences between practitioners and professors (at the .01 level) regarding their perceptions of the Readiness Stage.

While these practices are valued by both practitioners and professors, only practice eight, having the principal and central office initiate the Readiness Stage activities, was reported as implemented to any substantial extent by both groups. None of the other practices was reported as being implemented often or almost always by over 50 percent of the professors. At least one-half of the practitioners, however, indicated that four of the Readiness practices were implemented "often" or "almost always" in the inservice programs with which they were familiar. These practices

included:

* having goals for school improvement written collaboratively by teachers, parents, and administrators.

* having a written list of goals for program improvement in each school that covered a duration of 3-5 years.

* having a school staff adopt and support the goals for school improvement, and

* having the school staff identify specific plans for achieving the school's goals for improvements.

Interestingly, practitioners and professors differed on their perception that the Readiness practices were actually implemented in real programs. The t-tests of the means of the two groups showed that significantly (at the .01 level) more of the practitioners reported that these practices were employed in schools. The only exception was practice 8, where there was no difference between the two groups.

Planning Stage

There were 11 practices which define the Planning Stage (Table 2). It is in this stage that the broad goals of the Readiness Stage are translated into specific objectives and a needs assessment is conducted (needs assessment = difference between desired and actual practices). The needs assessment includes gathering information directly from the school staff using these data as a basis for planning staff development activities. Part of the data collected from the faculty should include information about the learning styles of those who will participate in the inservice activites.

Since the staff development goals cover a three to five-year period, staff development objectives should also be written to cover that same period of time. These objectives identify the attitudes, knowledge, and skills that are to be developed in the inservice training program.

During this stage, the resources (time, money and materials) that will be available for staff development are identified prior to developing specific inservice activities. This kind of information is needed before we can plan realistic inservice programs. There is no use developing highly sophisticated training programs and planning on involving large numbers of faculty if the funds and other resources are not available.

Leadership in this stage is shared among teachers and administrators. At the beginning, administrators and/or outside consultants will be needed to guide the planning since most teachers and principals are not skilled or trained in planning staff development programs. The first few experiences

TABLE 2: PLANNING STAGE PRACTICES

RPTIM PRACTICES	% of Often/Almost Always Ratings			
	Should Be		Exist	
	COPIS	NSDC	COPIS	NSDC
(9.) Differences between desired and actual practices in the school are examined to identify the inservice needs of the staff.	100	97	25	44*
10. Planning of staff development activities relies, in part, upon information gathered directly from school staff members.	98	97	32	77*
11. In service planners use information about the learning styles of participants when planning staff development activities	85	95	5	38*
12. Staff development programs include objectives for inservice activities covering as much as five years.	76	81	5	24*
[13.] The resources (time, money, and materials) available for use in staff development are identified prior to planning inservice activities.	90	94	49	76*
14. Staff development programs include plans for activities to be conducted during the following three to five years.	75	85*	5	27*
[15.] Specific objectives are written for staff development activities.	90	97	33	77*
16. Staff development objectives include objectives for attitude development (new outlooks and feelings).	90	94	15	48*
17. Staff development objectives for increased knowledge (new information and understanding).	97	95	67	82*
18. Staff development objectives include objectives for skill development (new work behaviors).	95	98	55	81*
(19.) Leadership during the planning of inservice programs is shared among teachers and administrators.	95	96	23	68*

(30) = A practice seen as essential by both Professors (COPIS) and Practitioners (NSDC)
[30] = A practice seen as essential by Practitioners (NSDC)
* = Significant Difference (.01 level) in the mean responses recorded by Professors and Practitioners.

teachers and administrators have in the design of their staff development programs become "guided practice" for when they will eventually take the entire responsibility for the Planning Stage in later staff development efforts.

Over 90 percent of both the professors and practitioners indicated that eight of the eleven planning practices or outcomes should be implemented "often" or "almost always." (Table 2) Seventy percent or more of both groups supported all of these practices at the "often" or "amost always" level. Both the COPIS and NSDC groups indicated that the essential planning practices were (1) conducting a needs assessment and (2) using shared leadership among teachers and administrators to plan inservice activites. In addition, practitioners indicated that two other outcomes were essential: (1) identifying the resources available for staff development prior to planning inservice programs and (2) having specific written objectives to guide staff development activities.

When a comparison was made between responses of practitioners and professors, only one practice showed a significant difference. Practitioners, members of the National Staff Development Council, were significantly more likely to believe that staff development programs should include plans for activities to be conducted over a three to five year period.

Regarding the extent to which the planning practices were implemented, only two were viewed as practiced "often" or "almost always" by over half of both practitioners and professors. Those practices dealt with the use of knowledge (practice 17) and skill objectives (practice 18) to guide staff development. In addition, over two-thirds of the practitioners indicated that four other practices in this stage were implemented "often" or "almost always" in staff development programs. Those practices include:

* planning staff development activities which rely in part upon information gathered directly from staff members in the schools.

* identifying the time, money and materials available for staff development prior to planning inservice activities.

* having specific objectives written for staff development activities.

* sharing the leadership during the planning of inservice programs among teachers and administrators.

When the extent to which practitioners and professors perceived that the 11 Planning Stage outcomes were implemented in schools were compared,

practitioners were significantly higher in their perceptions of implmentation on all of the planning practices.

By now, you can see a pattern that emerged in the data for all five stages of the model, i.e., the strong commitment to the practices which defined each of the stages and significant differences between the two groups in perceptions of implementation, with the practitioners believing implementation occurred at a higher level than did professors.

Training Stage

There are nine practices in the Training Stage (Table 3) which describe the nature of staff development training activities. As we pointed out earlier, these practices are supported by research in the area of adult learning (e.g., people learn more when they have an opportunity to interact in learning teams of two to seven participants during staff development). Rather than working on low-level cognitive outcomes, people working in small groups are much more likely to achive a higher level of cognitive learning than when they are on their own (I/D/E/A, 1971).

Options permeate the design of the training phases. To the extent possible, staff members should have choices in the behavioral objectives that they will pursue in their professional development programs. In addition, they should have a chance to choose whether they will become involved in certain kinds of inservice activities and an opportunity to choose the specific learning activities in which they will participate.

Regardless of choices, however, there needs to be an opportunity for participants to have direct experiences which will allow them to try out the new behaviors, techniques, and understandings that they are developing. This kind of direct, concrete, hands-on experinece, is much more important than we thought in the past. The literature on experiential learning suggests that what is learned through direct experience is much more likely to be remembered and used after the training (Coleman, 1976). Such experiences allow people to get a gestalt of what they are learning and begin to see how the various parts of the inservice training actually looks in practice. It also has a positive impact on the participants in that they can see how what they're studying at the theoretical level has a very practical application in day-to-day school practice (Wood, Thompson, 1980; Thompson, Wood, 1982).

There are a number of practices that are related to leadership during the Training Stage. The use of peer teachers to deliver inservice is one such practice. This practice is tempered, however, by the belief that the primary criterion for selecting leadership for inservice activities is expertise. This means that if the person is directing a workshop on

TABLE 3: TRAINING STAGE PRACTICES

RPTIM PRACTICES	% of Often/Almost Always Ratings			
	Should Be		Exist	
	COPIS	NSDC	COPIS	NSDC
20. Staff development activities include the use of learning teams in which two to seven participants share and discuss learning experiences.	71	86	15	30*
21. Individual school staff members choose objectives for their own professional learning.	90	93*	18	49*
22. Individual school staff members choose the staff development activities in which they participate.	93	90	31	67*
23. Staff development activities include experiential activities in which participants try out new behaviors and techniques.	100	94	18	58*
24. Peers help to teach one another by serving as inservice leaders.	98	91	20	57*
25. School principals participate in staff development activities with their staffs.	98	98	20	60*
26. Leaders of staff development activities are selected according to their expertise rather than their position.	98	98	36	75*
27. As participants in staff development activities become increasingly competent, leadership behavior becomes less directive or task-oriented.	98	90	25	54*
28. As participants in staff development activities become increasingly confident in their abilities, the leader transfers increasing responsibility to the participants.	98	96	23	60*

○ = A practice seen as essential by both Professors (COPIS) and Practitioners (NSDC).
□ = A practice seen as essential by Practitioners (NSDC).
* = Significant Difference (.01 level) in the mean responses recorded by Professors and Practitioners.

individualized instruction, that person knows how to individualize instruction ans has had experience in actually individualizing as well as in teaching others to do this.

By indicating that peer teaching should be practiced, we're simply saying that given the option and expertise, a peer teacher should be given priority, i.e., teachers teaching teachers and administrators teaching administrators. If such peer leadership is not available, then one of the first activities in the Training Stage should be to train local staff members who can eventually deliver inservice for the rest of their fellow teachers or administrators.

As the inservice participants become increasingly competent during training, the leaders should move from being directive and supportive to reinforcing or supporting appropriate behaviors. Eventually, the leader should withdraw and leave the participants on their own.

It is important that school principals participate in training activities with their staffs. This, in itself, demonstrates the importance the principal places on the inservice and also helps the principal identify the kinds of support that will be necessary to implement the practices that are being learned in inservice.

As in the previous two stages, there was strong support among respondents for implementing these practices "often" or "almost always" in staff development programs. Ninety percent or more of both the practitioners and professors supported all of these outcomes with the exception of Outcome 20 (Table 3). In this instance over 70 percent of both the practitioners and professors indicated that staff development activities should include the use of learning teams. In no case did both practitioners and professors see these practices as essential to staff development. However, practitioners did indicate that having the school principals participate in staff development activities with their staffs and having leaders of staff development activities selected for their expertise rather than position were essential practices.

Again when the mean responses reported by practitioners and professors were compared only one item showed differences at the .01 level. Although practitioners believed, significantly more than professors, that school staff members should choose objectives for their own professional learning, over 90 percent of both groups indicated that this practice should be used "often" or "almost always."

While less than 40 percent of the professors indicated that these training practices were implemented "often" or "almost always" in current inservice programs, more than 50 percent of the practitioners reported that

seven of these practices were implemented "often" or "almost always." The practices employed "often" or "almost always" included (1) providing individual school staff members with a choice of staff development activities in which they participate, (2) providing experientally based activities in which participants could try out the new behaviors and techniques they were learning, (3) using peer teachers as inservice leaders, (4) having principals participate in staff development with their teachers, (5) selecting staff development leaders based upon their expertise, rather than position, (6) using less directive leadership as participants become more competent, and, finally, (7) transferring leadership and reponsibility for the training to the participants as they became more competent and confident. The practitioners reported significantly higher implementation than did the professors for all nine training practices.

Implementation Stage

The fourth stage, Implementation, consists of six practices (Table 4). In this stage what has been learned in the controlled setting of the training is integrated into the everyday work life of staff members. It's here, after the training, that participants are provided assistance in implementing the new behaviors. In addition, staff members need to be recognized by administrators and others for their attempts to implement the new learning that they've obtained during their training. Inservice leaders visit the job setting to help the participants review and refine their previous learning. It's here also that the teachers and administrators call upon their peers to observe and assist them to implement their new learnings.

Resources need to be allocated to assist participants in the new skills and behaviors that have been learned in the training. Funds need to be made available to purchase instructional materials, planning time, additional training and/or supervision. These resources should be identified early, possibly in the Planning Stage. The only people that usually have access to and control of those funds and who can make them available are principals and central office staff.

The final practice in this stage is making sure the school principal demonstrates support for teachers' efforts to change by visiting the classroom, giving recognition in faculty meetings, and sharing positive information with the central office, among other strategies.

When we look at the responses of both professors and practitioners, we find that five of the six practices were valued by 95 percent or more of both groups (Table 4). Over three-fourths of the practitioners and

TABLE 4: IMPLEMENTATION OF STAGE PRACTICES

RPTIM PRACTICES	% of Often/Almost Always Ratings			
	Should Be		Exist	
	COPIS	NSDC	COPIS	NSDC
29. After participating in inservice activities, participants have access to support services to help implement new behaviors as part of their regular work.	98	99	8	53*
30. School staff members who attempt to implement new learnings are recognized for their efforts.	95	99	10	42*
31. The leaders of staff development activities visit the job setting, when needed, to help the inservice participants refine or review previous learning.	95	96	5	42*
32. School staff members use peer supervision to assist one another in implementing new work behaviors.	78	81	3	19*
33. Resources (time, money, and materials) are allocated to support the implementation of new practices following staff development activities (funds to purchase new instructional materials, time for planning, etc.)	100	98	15	48*
34. The school principal actively supports efforts to implement changes in professional behavior.	98	99	37	58

○ = A practice seen as essential by both Professors (COPIS) and Practitioners (NSDC).
□ = A practice seen as essential by Practitioners (NSDC).
* = Significant Difference (.01 level) in the mean responses recorded by Professors and Practitioners.

professors also indicated they thought that peer supervision should be availabe "often" or "almost always" during the Implementation Stage of inservice. Three of these practices were seen as essential by both practitioners and professors. The essential Implementation practices include: (1) giving the inservice participants access to support services after the training to help them incorporate new behaviors into their regular work activities; (2) making sure that time, money, and materials are allocated to support the implementation of new practices following training; and (3) making sure that principals actively support implementation efforts by inservice participants once they return to their jobs. There were no significant differences in the extent to which professors and practitioners valued these six practices.

It is in this stage that we saw the lowest overall levels of implementation. Only two practices were reported as having been employed "often" or "almost always" by half of the practitioners. Practitioners believed that teachers do have access to help after they have had inservice and that principals do actively support the efforts of teachers as they attempt to implement changes in their regular professional behaviors on the job. Again, practitioners were significantly more likely to see these practices implemented than were professors.

Maintenance Stage

In the Maintenance Stage there are only four practices (Table 5). These practices make sure that once something has been learned in Training and implemented in daily practice, it continues to exist at a high level of performance. In Maintenance we are concerned with a systematic program of instructional supervision to monitor the new work behaviors. This supervision is provided by a principal, by peers, through self-monitoring, or through feedback from students. For instance, staff members might systematically use techniques of self-monitoring to maintain the things that they've learned to do as ongoing parts of their work. It may also include student feedback as a way of monitoring the use of new practices. Both the teachers and the administrators have the responsibility to make sure that the new behaviors are maintained; leadership here is a shared responsibility.

Two of the Maintenance practices, self-monitoring and shared responsibility for maintenance, were viewed by 90 percent of both practitioners and professors as something that should happen "often" or "almost always." The use of supervision and student ratings were supported by over three-fourths of both groups. Again, there were no significant differences in the degree of commitment reported by both the professors and

TABLE 5: MAINTENANCE STAGE PRACTICES

	RPTIM PRACTICES	% of Often/Almost Always Ratings			
		Should Be		Exist	
		COPIS	NSDC	COPIS	NSDC
35.	A systematic program of instructional supervision is used to monitor new work behavior.	88	95	5	32*
36.	School staff members utilize systematic techniques of self-monitoring to maintain new work behaviors.	97	92	5	16*
37.	Student feedback is used to monitor new practices.	85	78	3	15
(38)	Responsibility for the maintenance of new school practices is shared by both teachers and administration.	98	99	12	44*

○□ = A practice seen as essential by both Professors (COPIS) and Practitioners (NSDC).
□ = A practice seen as essential by Practitioners (NSDC).
* = Significant Difference (.01 level) in the mean responses recorded by Professors and Practitioners.

practitioners to each of the Maintenance practices. The sharing of responsibility for Maintenance was viewed as an essential practice by both practitioners and professors.

When we look at the extent to which Maintenance practices are implemented, we find that none were reported by either group as being implemented "often" or "almost always." Significantly more practitioners than professors perceived that there was a systematic program of instructional supervision to monitor new work behaviors and that there was shared responsibility for maintenance of new practices being implemented in the schools in which they worked. There were no differences on the other two practices.

Summary of Major Findings on the RPTIM Practices

Based upon these findings, we have reached the following conclusions about the 38 practices in this five-stage model:

* There is strong support for all 38 practices. Both practitioners and professors believe that the practices that define the Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance Stages should be implemented "often" or "almost alwyas" when staff development is designed for schools.

* With limited exception, there is no disagreement in the extent to which these 38 practices are valued by professors and practitioners.

* There are nine practices regarded as essential by both practitioners and professors in the planning and delivering of staff development programs. Thesy are: 1) developing a positive school climate before starting a staff development efforts; 2) having a school staff adopt and support the goals of a school improvement program; 3) involving the school staff in the selection of the plans to achieve the school's goals for improvement; 4) examining the differences between the desired practice and actual practies to determine inservice needs; 5) sharing leadership when planning inservice among teachers and administrators; 6) providing inservice participants with access to support services after training to implement what they learned into their regular work; 7) budgeting money, time and personnel to support implementation of new practices following training; 8) having the principals actively support teacher efforts to implement change in their behavior after inservice; and 9) sharing among teachers and administrators the responsibility for maintaining new practices after they have been institutionalized.

* Practitioners see more of the practices in the model as essential than do professors.

* There are only three of the 38 practices that over 50 percent of both the practitioners and the professors believed are implemented "often" or "almost always" in inservice programs.

* Practitioners (NSDC members) are signifcantly more likely to see the practices implemented than are Professors of Instructional Supervision. In fact, 50 percent of the practitioners report that 20 of these 38 practices are implemented in schools "often" or "almost always."

REACTION TO ASSUMPTIONS

In addition to examining the extent to which these practices existed and were implemented in staff development programs, the practitioners and professors were asked to indicate the degree to which they supported the assumptions underlying this five-stage model and the 38 practices (Table 6). We found that over 90 percent of both groups agreed with nine of the assumptions. The only assumption that did not receive this level of support was the assumption that "the school is the most appropriate unit of change--not the district or the individual." Only three-fourths of the professors and about one-half of the practitioners indicated that they "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with this assumption. The reason for the smaller support for this assumption is not clear. It is quite possible that if the item had been stated differently, it might have gained greater support. This assumption certainly has considerable importance in Goodlad's (1984) conclusions regarding the change process. No significant differences were found in the extent to which both groups valued these ten assumptions.

FACTORS RELATED TO THE COMMITMENT OF THE RPTIM MODEL

While the primary concern for surveying the members of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision and the National Staff Development Council was to determine the face validity and extent of implementation of the model practices, a secondary concern was to determine whether experiences, training, knowledge, and interests of the respondents were related to commitment to use these practices. To assess these relationships, Pearson Product Moment Correlations were run between each of the practices and the respondents:

* number of years in his or her current position.
* estimated percentage of time spent designing and delivering and evaluating staff development programs.
* extent of interest in staff development.
* current knowledge of inservice practice in the schools.
* extent of interaction with school personnel who plan, deliver, and evaluate inservice programs.
* extent of personal work in schools planning, delivering, and

TABLE 6: BELIEF ITEMS

ASSUMPTIONS	% of Agree/Strongly Agree	
	COPIS	NSDC
1. All school personnel should be involved in professional development throughout their careers to stay current and effective.	100	99
2. Significant improvement in educational practice takes considerable time and is the result of systematic, long-range staff development.	100	99
3. Inservice education should focus on improving the quality of the school program.	95	99
4. Adult learners are motivated to risk learning new behaviors when they believe they have control over the learning situation and are free from threat.	93	99
5. Educators vary widely in their professional competencies, readiness for learning and approaches to learning.	100	99
6. Professional growth requires commitment to new performance norms.	92	96
7. Organizational health, including factors such as social climate, trust, open communication, and peer support for change in practices influences the success of professional development programs.	100	99
8. The school is the most appropriate unit of change, not the district or the individual.	75	56
9. School districts have the primary responsibility for providing the resources and training necessary for a school staff to implement new programs and improve instruction.	100	97
10. The school principal is the "gate-keeper" or key element for adoption and continued use of new practices and programs in a school.	97	93

evaluating inservice programs.

* extent of interaction with central office personnel, building administration, teachers, etc., to plan, deliver and evaluate inservice.

* extent of formal and informal training in staff development.

It would appear from the data that the more practitioners were interested in and worked with inservice, especially in collaboration with principals and teachers, the most positive they were about the model. An examination of the significant correlations suggests that practitioners' commitment to the practices are related to: (1) the percentage of time they gave to the design, delivery and evaluation of inservice; (2) the extent of their interests in inservice; and (3) the extent to which they worked with principals and teachers to plan, deliver, and evaluate inservice programs.

For professors, the more they worked with personnel who planned, delivered, and evaluated inservice, carried out similar activities themselves, and perceived themselves as knowledgeable about inservice practices in school, the more positive they were about the model. Professors' commitments to the 38 practices were related to: (1) their current knowledge of inservice practices in schools; (2) the extent to which they interacted with school personnel who plan, deliver, and evaluate inservice; and (3) the extent to which they personally worked in schools planning, conducting, and evaluating inservice programs.

CLOSING THOUGHTS

Based upon the high degree of support for the practices and assumptions of the RPTIM Model, we have concluded that the five-stage approach to staff development described in the 1981 ASCD Yearbook does at least have face validity. It is a model that experts, both practitioners and professors, in the area of staff development believe should guide operational practice when planning, delivering, and institutionalizing inservice programs. It gives us a framework that addresses problems, makes recommendations, and includes the major characteristics of what others have said should be included in effective inservice. The model also provides what we have so badly needed--a comprehensive, systmatic process for staff development.

Practitioners and professors are not as far apart in what they believe should be going on as we might suspect. Frequently, we hear practitioners talking about professors in their "ivory towers" not really knowing what is going on in schools and not being practical about what can and should

happen in school programs, including staff development programs. At the same time, professors have complained about the quality of inservice programs and that practitioners really don't know what they ought to be doing in staff development. This study points out that neither is true! Practitioners and professors agree on what is necessary and ought to be more supportive of one another. In fact, given the financial and educational problems we face, it's time for practitioners and professors to work together to get effective inservice practices implemented in schools.

REFERENCES

Coleman, James S. "Differences Between Experiential and Classroom Learning". Experiential Learning: Rationale, Characteristics and Assessments pp. 49-61. Edited by Morris T. Keeton and Associates, Washington, D. C.: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Goodlad, John I. (1984). A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Institute for the Development of Educational Activities (I/D/E/A) (1971). Learning in the Small Group. Dayton, OH: Institute for the Development of Educational Activities.

Joyce, Bruce & Peck, Lucy. (1977). Inservice Teacher Education Report II: Interviews. Syracuse, NY: National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University.

McQuarrie, Frank O., Fred H. Wood, and Steven R. Thompson. "The Staff Development Maze: Where are WE?" The NASSP Bulletin. pp. 75-82 (February, 1984).

Thompson, Steven R. "A Survey and Analysis of Pennsylvania Public Schools Personnel Perceptions of Staff Development Practices and Beliefs with a View to Identify Some Critical Problems or Needs." Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1982.

Thompson, S. R., F. H. Wood. Staff Development Guidelines Reaffirmed: A Response to Fonzi. Educational Leadership. 49(1):34-35 (October 1982).

Wagstaff, Lonnie and Tom McCullough. "Inservice Education: Education's Disaster Area." Administrators Notebook,21 (May, 1973).

Wood, Fred H., Frank O. McQuarrie, and Steven R. Thompson. "Practitioners and Professors Agree on Effective Staff Development Practices." Educational Leadership. 40(1):28-31 (October, 1982)

Wood, F. H., S. R. Thompson. Guidelines for Better Staff Development. Educational Leadership. 37(5):374-378 (February, 1980).

Wood, F. H., S. R. Thompson, F. Russell. Designing Effective Staff Development Programs. Chapter 4 in Staff Development/Organization Development pp. 59-91. Edited by Betty Dillon Peterson. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA (1981).